

Appl. No. 10/663,188  
Amdt. dated August 25, 2005  
Reply to office action of June 29, 2005

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 29, 2005. The Office Action rejected Applicants' Claims 23-41 under non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting. The Office Action rejected Applicants' Claim 23 under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite. The Office Action also rejected Applicants' Claims 23-41 as being obvious in view of combination of US Pat. No. 6,587,787 ("Yokota") and US Pat. No. 6,397,143 ("Peschke").

Applicants have amended Claims 23, 34, 35, 37, 39 and 40. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application in view of the following remarks. Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

#### **Double Patenting**

Applicants do not agree that Claims 23-41 are obvious over the claims of U.S. Pat. No. 6,650,326. However, in order to expedite prosecution and allowance of the present application, a terminal disclaimer and associated fee are submitted herewith. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of Claims 23-41 be withdrawn.

#### **35 USC § 112, ¶ 2**

Applicants have amended Claim 23 to correct the insufficient antecedent basis identified in the Office Action. Applicants believe that the recited claim element "wherein the two component images in the intermediate image are at a same scale" is not vague and ambiguous. Rather, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the plain meaning of this claim element. Additionally, dependent Claims 28 and 29 further define this subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of Claim 23 under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/663,188  
Amdt. dated August 25, 2005  
Reply to office action of June 29, 2005

### 35 USC § 103

#### Independent Claim 23

Applicants' independent Claim 23 relates to a method for displaying a zooming operation on a display screen. According to Claim 23, between the displaying of the first image at the first scale and the second image at the second scale, an *intermediate image* is displayed. The intermediate image is a temporary transitional image that illustrates a relationship between the first image and the second image. The intermediate image combines two component images showing at least some of the same features of the first image and second image. In the intermediate image, the two component images are at a same scale and coincide. Applicants' independent Claim 23 is not obvious in view of the combination of Yokota and Peschke because the combination fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements. Specifically, both Yokota and Peschke fail to disclose or suggest displaying the *intermediate image*.

First, as explained in Amendment A filed on March 14, 2005 and as indicated by the Office Action (page 5), Yokota does not disclose the intermediate image. Although, Yokota performs zooming between scales (*see*, Yokota: column 6, lines 10-14), Yokota does not disclose the intermediate image that is a temporary transitional image to provide context between images at different scales. For example, when Yokota system performs zooming between a smallest scale and a small scale (*see*, Yokota: column 9, lines 20-23), the display first shows a first map at the smallest scale and then shows a second map at the small scale without displaying the recited intermediate image between the two first and second maps that is a temporary transitional image. Thus, Yokota completely fails to disclose or suggest the intermediate image.

The Office Action relied on Peschke for disclosing the intermediate image. (*see*, Office Action, page 5.) However, Peschke also fails to disclose or suggest displaying the intermediate image that is a temporary transitional image to illustrate a relationship between the first and second images. Peschke discloses a system that displays map images and allows users to select areas for zooming. The display system of Peschke comprises images at levels of Region, Neighborhood, Shopping Center, and Store. (*see*, Peschke: column, 4 lines 9-30). Additionally, an intermediate (business district) level may be

Appl. No. 10/663,188  
Amdt. dated August 25, 2005  
Reply to office action of June 29, 2005

included between the Region and the Neighborhood levels where there is a high density of shopping centers, and the intermediate level would better allow users to select areas for zooming. (*see*, Peschke: column 6, line 67 – column 7, line 5). Although Peschke performs zooming from one level to the next including the intermediate level, the Peschke display system does not provide the intermediate image that is a temporary transitional image providing context between the images at the different levels. Rather, Peschke merely displays the map image at the Region level and then the map image at the Business District (intermediate) level without providing the recited transitional image. Thus, Peschke completely fails to disclose or suggest the recited intermediate image.

For at least these reasons, Applicants' Claim 23 is not obvious in view of the combination of Yokota and Peschke. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 23 be withdrawn.

#### Independent Claim 34

Applicants' independent Claim 34 relates to a method of providing context while zooming an image. According to Claim 34, after displaying the first image at the first scale and before displaying the second image at the second scale for a zoom operation, a *transitional image* is displayed. As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 23, Yokota and Peschke fail to disclose displaying the transitional image between the first image at the first scale and the second image at the second scale. Accordingly, this claim is not obvious in view of the combination of Yokota and Peschke. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 34 be withdrawn.

#### Independent Claim 37

Applicants' independent Claim 37 relates to a method of presenting an image on a display screen. According to Claim 37, the method presents a *transitional image* on the display screen. As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 23, Yokota and Peschke fail to disclose presenting a transitional image. Accordingly, this claim is not obvious in view of the combination of Yokota and Peschke. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 37 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/663,188  
Amdt. dated August 25, 2005  
Reply to office action of June 29, 2005

#### Independent Claim 40

Applicants' independent Claim 40 relates to a method of zooming an image. According to Claim 40, the method displays a *transitional image* after displaying the representation of the features at the first scale (first representation) and before displaying at least some of the same features at the second scale (second representation). As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 23, Yokota and Peschke fail to disclose presenting a transitional image. Accordingly, this claim is not obvious in view of the combination of Yokota and Peschke. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 40 be withdrawn.


#### Applicant's dependent Claims 24-33, 35-36, 38-39 and 41

Applicant's dependent Claims 24-33, 35-36, 38-39 and 41 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend upon allowable base claims. In addition, these claims include features that are not disclosed by the cited references.

#### Conclusion

With the present response, all the issues in the Office Action mailed June 29, 2005 have been addressed. Applicant submits that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jon D. Shutter  
Reg. No. 41,311  
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC  
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza Drive, Suite 900  
Chicago, IL 60654  
(312) 894-7000 x7365